



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF SACRED LITERATURE

JESUS OF NAZARETH

HOW HE THOUGHT, LIVED, WORKED, AND ACHIEVED

By ERNEST D. BURTON

JESUS WORKING IN GALILEE (*Continued*)

14. JESUS EMPLOYS HIS DISCIPLES AS HELPERS IN HIS WORK MARK 6:7-56

Mark 1:16-20 contains the story of Jesus calling four fishermen to leave their business and become his companions and fellow-workers. In 2:14 he is recorded as making a similar request of Matthew, the tax collector. In 3:13-19 he is said to have enlarged the group to twelve, whom he chose "that they might be with him, and that he might send them forth to preach, and to have authority to cast out demons." Turn back and read these passages, and then read Mark 6:7-13. Notice that the disciples, having been *with him* for some time, are now being *sent out*. Compare 3:14, 15 with 6:12, 13. The instructions that he gives them seem very strange to us, but they were manifestly adapted to the circumstances under which they were given. To wear two coats (tunics) was a sign of wealth. People were accustomed to give travelers food without pay and would have been insulted by an offer to pay. To have more than one place of entertainment in a given village would consume time in visiting. Would Jesus have given the same directions in a cold climate, or if the disciples had had to cross the ocean, or if the customs of the country in respect to hospitality had been different from what they were? Why did he send them out two by two? Into what relation to the people to whom they were to preach would their dependence upon them for food bring them? What did Jesus aim to accomplish by this preaching and healing tour of his disciples? Why did he not limit them to preaching and forbid them to spend their time in healing sickness and casting out demons?

Read Mark 6:14-29. Why the narrative of the preaching of the Twelve is immediately followed by the story of the death of John the Baptist is not wholly clear. Perhaps the latter event happened while the disciples were on their tour. The Herod here spoken of was Herod Antipas, son of Herod the Great, who died in Jesus' infancy (Matt. 2:1-19). His real title was tetrarch, though Mark gives him the courtesy-title of king. The Philip whom Herodias deserted to marry Herod was a private citizen. In what light does this story present the Herodian family from the point of view of private morals? What kind of a ruler does it show Herod to have been? Was the character of his rule affected by his private morals? Were the imprisonment and execution of John lawful, according to the usages of that time? What is fundamentally wrong in a government under

which such things are lawful? How does its fundamental estimate of people, as people, compare with that of Jesus?

Read Mark 6:30-44 and give a title to the story. Verse 35 locates this event by the Sea of Galilee. The fact that the grass was green (vs. 39) implies that it occurred in the spring, as the summer heat dries up the grass in Palestine. Perhaps the crowds were on their way to Jerusalem to attend the feast of the Passover, which occurred in March or April. The incident just as it is told in the Gospels is quite beyond the range of present-day experience, and some people who are strongly impressed with the teaching of modern science respecting the uniformity of the laws of nature (cf. Mark 4:26-29) have difficulty with it. In every respect, however, except the miraculous multiplication of food the narrative is true to the situation and the probabilities of the case. Jesus invites his disciples to go apart and rest. The people come. They seem to his compassionate heart like sheep without a shepherd. He gives up his rest and teaches them until night comes on. Then they are hungry, but it is too late to go away and get food, and he tells his disciples that they must manage to feed them. He takes charge of the matter, gives directions to his disciples, uses the food that he finds at hand, and everybody is fed. Aside from the question how so little fed so many, is the Jesus of this story the Jesus you have found in the Gospels thus far? In what is he interested? For what is he concerned? What characteristics does he exhibit? Have we here efficiency without goodness, goodness without efficiency, or efficient goodness?

What is the most significant feature of this story, Jesus' compassionate interest in people and all their needs, which made him both teach them and feed them, or his making much out of the little available food?

Read Mark 6:45-52. Notice especially vs. 45 showing how Jesus undertook to secure for the disciples the rest they had missed, vs. 46 illustrating Jesus' own habits, and vs. 50 showing the influence of Jesus' presence on his disciples. Compare Mark 4:35-41. What is the explanation of that influence?

Read Mark 6:53-56. Consider again the relative place in Jesus' life of healing the sick and teaching. Why did he teach? Why did he heal the sick? Why did he feed the hungry? What did he seek to accomplish by his life?

Suggestions for further study: 1. How many members of the Herodian family are mentioned in the New Testament? What is their permanent place in history as compared with that of their political subjects, John the Baptist and Jesus? What makes the difference? 2. How much of Jesus' instructions to the twelve apostles applies to missionary work today? 3. In what respects does the story of Jesus' feeding the multitude furnish an example to us? Is human hunger a fact which we can neglect? Is human need of any kind a fact to be ignored? If Jesus could make five loaves do the work of five thousand, and we can induce a thousand people each to give five loaves, what would our possession of his interest in people lead us to do? Wherein would the results in the two cases be different? 4. Jesus relieved suffering but organized no agency to do so, or to remove the causes of poverty. What would the possession of his spirit lead us to do today? If the same spirit leads us to a different thing from that which he did, why is this? 5. Has the world made any progress since the days of the Herods in its idea of what constitutes good government? If so, in what direction and to what extent? What is the true purpose of government? Jesus did not meddle with political affairs. Have his teaching and example any bearing on

what constitutes good government? Have they had any influence in the development of better forms of government in the past? Have they any bearing on the present industrial situation? on present international problems?

15. DISCUSSION ON FOOD AND CHARACTER. MARK 7:1-23

Read Mark 7:1-5. Notice: (a) That as before¹ the Pharisees had criticized Jesus for allowing the disciples to neglect fasting, and to disregard the strict law of the Sabbath, so now they are finding fault with him for allowing his disciples to disregard the Pharisaic custom in respect to the washing of hands before meals. (b) That again the Pharisaic custom and scruple found their starting-point in the Old Testament law. The law of unclean foods (Leviticus, chap. 11) forbade the eating of certain kinds of food, and the tithing law required that a tenth of all the product of the soil and of the herd (Lev. 27:30-32) should be given to the Lord, i.e., be devoted to the support of worship. In their scrupulousness to avoid any accidental infraction of the law through particles of "unclean" or untithed food clinging to their hands, the Pharisees had made the custom of washing their hands before eating (see vs. 3) a matter of religion. (c) That the general name for all these regulations and customs which the Pharisees had built up around the law was "the tradition of the elders" or, as we might say, "the teaching of the fathers." (d) That Jesus did not encourage his disciples to observe these scruples.

Read Mark 7:6-13. Notice that Jesus does not continue the discussion of the particular matter of washing hands or eating "unclean" food, but takes up the general question of what was acceptable to God, the observance of traditions established by men, or the doing of the will of God. As his illustration of the disregard of the law of God, he cites the way in which the Pharisees, following the tradition, evaded the law in reference to children honoring their parents. Jesus seems here to be setting "scripture" over against "tradition." Does he do this because he believes that whatever is in the Old Testament is "the word of God" (see vs. 13), and whatever is later than the Old Testament is unauthoritative human tradition; or is he for the moment taking the point of view of the Pharisees with reference to the authority of the Old Testament in order to show them that from that point of view they could not defend their traditions; or does he accept the command to children to honor their parents as a law of God, not because it is in the Old Testament, but because it is self-evidently right, necessary for the welfare of human society? If you are in doubt on this matter, hold the question in suspense till we take up the remainder of the story.

Read Mark 7:17-22. These words deserve very careful study. Notice that in vs. 15 Jesus returns to the question whether it was necessary as a matter of religion to wash the hands before eating; or rather to the question that underlay that, namely, how is character affected by food? In vs. 15 he lays down the general principle, which he further explains and illustrates in vss. 18-23. Of course he is not saying that one's temper may not be affected by indigestion caused by overeating, or that intoxication has no indirect influence on character. He is laying down the broad general principle that evil character is the product of one's choices and deeds, not of one's food. He no doubt has specially in mind the law of Leviticus, with its minute distinctions between clean and unclean meats; but his

¹ See Mark 2:1-3:6.

statement is not limited to that law. Where did Jesus find this principle? Is it stated in the Old Testament? Does it underlie the law of Leviticus, or does it contradict it? Could it be learned by experience and observation? Does human experience in general sustain it? If he set aside the Levitical law of clean and unclean foods, on the basis of his observation of human experience, can he have judged that the law of children and parents in Exodus and Deuteronomy was the word of God (see vss. 9-13) because he found it in the Old Testament, or must he have had some other reason than this for ascribing to it divine authority?

Suggestions for further study: The passage just studied throws much light on Jesus' thought about religion from four points of view. 1. Verses 18-23 deal with the relation of conduct and character, and what kind of conduct affects character. Two different ideas have been found in these verses by different interpreters. Some have thought they mean that evil deeds *are the expression of* an evil heart; others that they mean that the evil thoughts men think and the evil deeds they do *make* men evil. Are both things true? Do evil thoughts and deeds defile the man, and does the defiled heart find expression in evil deeds, thus making a vicious circle? Which of the two things does Jesus say in vs. 23? Which is the natural antithesis to his statement in vss. 18, 19? Which is most important to remember? 2. Jesus seems to assume that unless eating or not eating a certain kind of food affects character, the rule against eating it is of no value or divine authority. What does that imply as to his thought about God? Did he believe that God makes laws that require or forbid external actions for their own sake without reference to their effect upon character? 3. Jesus calls one command of the Old Testament the word of God (vss. 9-13). He implies that another command also in the Old Testament, not being sustained by experience, had no sound basis or authority (vs. 15). How did he decide what commands of the Old Testament were the will of God and what were not? 4. In vs. 18 he seems to express surprise that the disciples did not at once see the truth of what he was saying. What does that imply as to the obligation of men to judge for themselves what is the will—the real law—of God?

16. A JOURNEY OUTSIDE OF JEWISH TERRITORY. MARK 7:24-8:26

Read Mark 7:24-30. In this narrative we have the only instance recorded in the Gospels of Jesus going outside of Jewish territory. Look up on a map the location of Tyre and Sidon in relation to Capernaum. The motive of this excursion into gentile territory was evidently not to preach but to rest, or to gain time for thought or conversation with the disciples. See vss. 24, 27, and notice that Matthew (15:24) expands the implication of vs. 27 into the explicit statement that Jesus said, "I was not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel." The term Greek in vs. 26 means simply "Gentile," not specifically a person of Greek blood, or one who spoke Greek. The word "Syrophenician" means a descendant of the Phoenicians of Syria, as distinguished from the Phoenicians of Africa. The matter of chief interest in the narrative is Jesus' reluctance to heal the girl, and his eventual yielding to the persistence of the woman. In view of what you have already read about Jesus in the Gospels, would you ascribe his reluctance to lack of sympathy with the child and her mother, or to a somewhat strong feeling that his own personal mission was to his own people? (The seeming harshness of the language is somewhat softened by the fact that the word "dogs" in vss. 27, 28 is a diminutive, and, if we may judge from this word and the woman's reply, that she understood him to be speaking, not of the scavenger dogs of the streets, but of

the dogs of the household. Perhaps it was still more softened by Jesus' way of speaking.) What does the fact that he finally yielded to the woman's plea show as to his controlling motive? Which was stronger, his general conviction that he should work only among Jews, or the appeal of human need regardless of race?

Read Mark 7:31-37. The word "Decapolis" means ten cities, and refers to a group of cities founded and controlled by Greeks in the larger sense of the term, most of them lying east of the Sea of Galilee and the Jordan. The region was therefore prevaillingly gentile. By what power did Jesus heal this deaf-mute?

Read Mark 8:1-10, and notice the close resemblance to the story of the feeding of the five thousand, told in Mark 6:30-46. Is it possible that this is another account of the same event, Mark having found the two narratives in different Gospels and assumed them to refer to different occasions? It is interesting to notice that Luke, who in general avoids telling two similar stories, though he sometimes repeats Jesus' sayings, omits this narrative, though he probably had it before him in Mark.

Read Mark 8:11-23. The idea that a prophet should prove himself such by signs from heaven was apparently a common one in Jesus' day, as the argument from miracles has been ever since. It is a remarkable fact that Jesus did not share this feeling. Moved by compassion he healed the sick and cast out demons, but as a rule he did not like to have even these works of his talked about. And when people demanded a sign he was distressed by the request, and peremptory in refusing it (see vs. 12). It is the more remarkable that Mark records this reply of Jesus, because he himself laid great stress on Jesus' deeds of power. Matthew apparently could not believe that Jesus meant to speak so unqualifiedly, and added the phrase (in 16:4) "except the sign of Jonah," which he has elsewhere interpreted as referring to the resurrection (Matt. 12:39, 40). Why did Jesus object to the demand for a sign?

Suggestions for further study: 1. Why was Jesus distressed at the demand for a sign from heaven? Was it that he felt that he had already given the Pharisees evidence that was sufficient to lead them to listen to him and to accept his teaching? If so, what was that evidence? 2. What was Jesus' reason for confining his work almost exclusively to Jews? Was it (a) because he knew nothing about the rest of the world? (b) because he regarded the Jews as the one people in whom God was interested? (c) because he himself had no interest in them? or (d) because he felt that his personal mission was to his own people? Would there be some reason for him to think that, the Jews having already the purest and highest religion of the ancient world, and being already scattered widely over the world, the most important thing for him to do was still further to purify and elevate this religion at its source? 3. Why did Paul pursue so different a course? Might Jesus have done as Paul did, if he had lived as long as Paul did? That is, might he in later years have gone into gentile lands? 4. Is Jesus' conduct in this matter an argument against foreign missions? If not, why not?

17. A SECOND JOURNEY FOR RETIREMENT. MARK 8:27-9:32

Read Mark 8:27-30. Find Caesarea Philippi on the map, and notice the direction of the journey and the proximity of Caesarea Philippi to Mt. Hermon. Had Jesus, so far as our records have shown, ever asked his disciples the questions which he is here recorded to have put to them? Compare what he said when he called the four fishermen (Mark 1:16-20), and when he chose the Twelve (Mark

3:13-19). Had any of the disciples before this said to Jesus what Peter now said? By what tie had the disciples of Jesus thus far been bound to him? Why did Jesus ask them the question of vs. 29? Why, if he wished his disciples to recognize him as the Christ, did he wish them not to tell others (vs. 30)? There was in Jesus' day a widespread expectation of the coming of the Christ (the Messiah), but people had very different ideas, and doubtless many of them very vague ideas, of what kind of a person he would be, and what he would do. Perhaps the two ideas that they all had were that he would represent God, and that he would be the Savior of Israel, but as to how he would save Israel there was much difference of opinion. Would the discussion of the question whether Jesus was the Christ or the idea that he was such have diverted attention from the real message and work of Jesus? Was his messiahship the thing he most wanted men to accept? As he discouraged much talk about his deeds of healing, so also may he have wished to keep the thought of his messiahship in the background? Yet the question was in the air, and at this point he seems to have felt that the time had come when, with his disciples but not with the people generally (compare Mark 4:11), he must discuss the matter, and, if they had come to think that he was the Christ, rid their minds of some of the false ideas that they associated with this belief. Was it perhaps for this purpose that he took this journey away from the large towns of Galilee? Notice the expression "the *villages* of Caesarea Philippi."

Read Mark 8:31-33. Notice that Jesus, having listened to Peter's declaration that he was the Christ, immediately began to tell Peter about the sufferings which he foresaw he would have to endure. These announcements were directly contrary to Peter's idea of the career of the Christ and therefore in his mind contrary to the declaration that he had just made that Jesus was the Christ. Peter expected the Christ to be accepted by the nation and to reign over it, not to be rejected by its leaders—to crush his enemies, not to be put to death. Naturally, therefore, he refused to accept the predictions of Jesus. But Jesus insisted upon it, saying that Peter was thinking men's thoughts, not God's. Do you recall anything in the previous record of Jesus' experience that would account for his expectation that the Jewish leaders would reject him and put him to death? Had he ever expected or hoped that they would receive him? What led him to believe that this suffering and death were God's thought for him? What was it in Peter's thinking that he characterized as the thoughts of men?

Read Mark 8:34-37. This is one of the most significant of all the utterances of Jesus. It should be read, remembering the conversation with Peter that precedes it. Peter had said Jesus was the Christ, meaning that he would be King of Israel, and no doubt thinking that when Jesus sat on the throne, he, Peter, would somehow share in his glory (compare Mark 10:35-37). Jesus did not deny that he was the Christ, but he did immediately say that, if so, he was to be a suffering Messiah, rejected by his people and dying at their hands. This idea Peter cannot accept. Jesus reaffirms it, and then adds the utterances of these verses, 34-37, in which he says that suffering is not for him only. Any man who would be his disciple must be ready for the same experience. What does Jesus mean by "denying one's self"? Does he mean (a) denying or ignoring one's own existence, (b) denying one's self some pleasure or comfort, or (c) refusing to make one's own interests the supreme thing in life? If the last, what would become the supreme thing in life?

What did Jesus make supreme? Does one who "takes up his cross" of necessity die on it? Does he signify his readiness to die, if need be? Verse 35 is manifestly paradoxical—seemingly self-contradictory, but its meaning is most important. "Life" is best understood as meaning not simply physical life, what one loses in death, but the sum total of the possibilities that come to us because we are alive, as when we say of a man, "He is wasting his life." If we take Jesus' words to mean, "Whoever makes it his purpose to keep his life for himself, in reality wastes it, and whosoever gives his life for the ends for which Jesus gave his really makes the most of it and gets the most out of it," would this be consistent with the spirit and teaching of Jesus as you have thus far found it in the Gospels? If Jesus based his philosophy of life on a study of human experience, do you think he might have learned this principle in this way? Is the word "life" in vss. 36, 37 probably also to be taken in the sense suggested above? Would Jesus dissuade men from risking their lives in the sense of risking the chance of death, or warn them not to waste their lives in the broader sense of the word? Is the former probable in view of what he has just said about taking up the cross?

Read Mark 8:38—9:1. These words have a distinctly "eschatological" sense (that is, a reference to the end of the world) that is quite lacking in the previous part of the passage. They emphasize the relation of men to Jesus rather than their attitude toward life in general, and they appeal to awards of the last judgment. Verse 1 of chapter 9 predicts a coming of the Kingdom of God with power in the lifetime of people then living and there present. The emphasis of the prediction is probably on the words *with power*. The Kingdom of God was already present in a sense. But Jesus foresaw a great increase of its power within the life of the generation then alive. He foresaw that he was to die, rejected by the Jews, but he did not believe that this meant the defeat of the Kingdom, but quite the contrary. What was the basis of this conviction of Jesus? Matthew (chap. 15) reports Jesus' statement in a form which makes it refer to Jesus' reappearance, because he thought that it was thus that the Kingdom would come with power. But Mark's language is undoubtedly the older form of the saying.

Read the story of the transfiguration in Mark 9:2-8. The high mountain referred to in vs. 2 is probably a spur of Mt. Hermon. Moses is of course the representative of the Law, Elijah of the Prophets. Together they represent the Old Testament and its religion and suggest the indorsement of Jesus by the Law and the Prophets. But the fact of central importance is the reutterance of the declaration of the baptism that Jesus is God's beloved Son, only now spoken not to Jesus but, even according to Mark's narrative, addressed to his disciples, "This is my beloved Son," and designed, it would seem, not to comfort Jesus but to assure and convince the disciples. That, after a talk with Jesus on the mountain top, in which they had perhaps discussed the relation of what Jesus was saying and doing to the Law and the Prophets, one of the disciples should have had such a vision as this is not strange. It is more remarkable, but perhaps not without parallel in religious history, that three men should have shared the experience. What part did this experience probably play in establishing the faith of Jesus' disciples in him, as compared with their daily contact with him, listening to his teaching, and observing his conduct?

Read Mark 9:9-13. Again Jesus charges his disciples not by public talk to contribute to the discussion of the question whether he is the Christ. Why did he wish to prevent discussion? What was the leading purpose of all his work? The question about Elijah is probably based on Mal. 4:5. Jesus' answer means that John the Baptist had fulfilled Malachi's prophecy.

Read Mark 9:14-27. This story of the epileptic boy is much like the other stories of persons supposed to be possessed of a demon that we have already studied. Notice the conduct of the father and recall that of Jairus (Mark 5:22-24, 35-42). Notice also Jesus' effort in both cases to develop the faith of the father. In whom did Jesus desire men to have faith? And what was the faith that he desired them to exercise? Read vs. 28, 29. Verse 29 seems to imply that some cases of this kind were peculiarly difficult to cure. If so, what does this suggest as to the relation of prayer to the hard tasks of life? An able surgeon once said that after a successful operation he always wanted to be alone with God for a time. What was probably the basis of that feeling, and is there any relation between that feeling and Jesus' saying in vs. 29?

Read Mark 9:30-32. Is it at all significant that as Jesus followed Peter's confession that he was the Christ by an announcement of his death, so the transfiguration experience was followed by a repetition of the announcement of his death? On the former occasion Peter would not accept the idea that Jesus was to die. Now the record says that the disciples did not understand the saying. What lay behind their inability to understand it? Did their unwillingness to believe it perhaps lead them to try to find in it something else than its plain meaning?

Read Mark 9:33-37. What does the fact that the disciples were discussing the question who was the greatest show as to how fully they had grasped the teaching of Jesus in Mark 8:34-37, and his announcement of his death? Verse 35 contains another of those simple yet fundamental and far-reaching sayings of Jesus of which there are so many in his teaching. Consider carefully what this sentence means. Was this a repetition of an idea commonly accepted and followed in Jesus' day, or was it a startling paradox? How many of those who heard it would suppose that it was meant to be taken literally, at once accept it, and begin to act upon it? Read vs. 37 carefully. What does receiving a little child in Jesus' name mean? May it refer to receiving anybody who brings a message from Jesus, even though only a little child? In other words, does it mean that not the bearer of the message, but the message, is important? Recalling the real nature of the teachings of Jesus thus far considered, do you find the basis of the second part of this verse in some external credentials that Jesus possessed that he brought a message from God, or in the character of the message itself? Compare Mark 8:12 and 7:18.

Read Mark 9:38-40. This is a very striking story. There were many people besides Jesus in that day who were casting out demons. Besides the methods described in the remarks in Mark 5:1-10, the method of incantation or reciting of magic formulas and the use of the names of deities or great personalities was often used. This man was probably a strolling exorcist who, having heard of Jesus as a successful healer of demoniacs, was using his name in an incantation, successfully it would seem from the statement of vs. 38. It was natural that the disciples should object. Is it surprising that Jesus did not object to such a use of his

name? Was the man apparently a disciple of his in any spiritual sense of the term? For what was Jesus most concerned, that unfortunate people should be helped (as despite his crude ways the man was apparently helping them), or that no one should misuse his name? He says that a man who used his name to do a great work would not easily speak against him. Would this fact be a sure protection against his being evilly spoken of, or was he taking some risk in relying on it?

Notice the broad tolerance of Jesus expressed in vs. 40. To get the full significance of it, consider how far this principle has been accepted by his followers and by religious bodies generally.

Read 9:41, 42. These verses state two reciprocal or complementary principles. Whoever has interest enough in Jesus to give a disciple of his so small a thing as a cup of cold water will not lose his reward. Whoever repels or hinders one who has an unintelligent faith in Jesus, as the exorcist who used Jesus' name had, is worthy of severest condemnation. What is the common thought or feeling that underlies both these sayings?

Read Mark 9:43-50. It is evidently the reference to giving offense or causing one to stumble (vs. 42) that suggests the inclusion of these sayings here. What is the common thought that underlies all these sayings? One of the most difficult, yet one of the most important, tasks of the interpreter is to distinguish sayings that are meant to be taken literally from those that involve bold figures of speech. See, for example, Mark 10:52. Is the language of these verses, 43-47, to be taken as a rule to be literally obeyed, or as a strong statement of the general principle that one ought to sacrifice anything, however dear, that endangers one's highest life? In view of vs. 42 can we infer that we should be more careful for our own interests than for those of others?

Suggestions for further study: The eighth and ninth chapters of Mark contain some of the most significant of Jesus' teachings, the understanding of which has much to do with really understanding Jesus. 1. Did Jesus look for a political Messiah? Did he expect or desire to be such a Messiah? Did he expect to be, or think he was, Messiah in any sense of the word then current? In any sense at all? If so, in what sense? What elements of the idea of messiahship would appeal to Jesus? 2. The statements in Mark 8:34-37 have sometimes been called "the secret of Jesus," that is, the key to all his thinking. What is the self-denial that he here implies he practices and that he enjoins his disciples to follow? Would it be correct to describe it as living socially, i.e., making common cause with one's fellows, devoting all one's energies, not to one's own pleasure or interests, but to the welfare of the community? Do you know of any people who have lived or are living in that way? Who get the most out of life, people who live in this way, or those who live for themselves? If the former, is this what Jesus means in vs. 35? What does the experience of men show to be the very best and wisest principle on which to live one's life? Which was the most successful life, that of Jesus of Nazareth or that of Alexander the Great? that of General Booth or that of William II of Germany?